

### **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Examiner alleges that the Applicants have not filed a certified copy of the foreign priority application as required by 35 U.S.C. § 119(b). The Examiner's position is respectfully traversed, since, as evidenced by form PCT/IB/304 filed as attachment E along with this national stage application, the International Bureau has been instructed to and has, in fact (as evidenced in PAIR), forwarded a copy of priority document JP 2004-152802. Therefore, acknowledgement of receipt of priority document JP 2004-152802 is respectfully requested.

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to improve their English grammar. The amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into a substitute specification and abstract. Attached are two versions of the substitute specification and abstract, a marked-up version showing the revisions, as well as a clean version. No new matter has been added.

Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. New claims 3 and 4 have been added.

Further, claim 1 has been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the reference relied upon in the rejection discussed below.

It is also noted that claim 1 has been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claim in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the

claim, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kojima (JP 2003-323150). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended claim 1 and new claims 3 and 4 for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites a method including generating, during a sustain period, a sustain discharge by alternately applying sustain pulses to a scan electrode and a sustain of a discharge cell of a plasma display panel. Further, claim 1 recites that (1) a rise time of a sustain pulse applied to the scan electrode (during the sustain period) is shortened at a frequency of once every three times a sustain pulse is applied thereto, and (2) a rise time of a sustain pulse applied to the sustain electrode (during the sustain period) is shortened at a frequency of once every three times a sustain pulse is applied thereto. In addition, claim 1 recites that (3) sustain pulses, applied to the scan electrode and the sustain electrode between the sustain pulses having the shortened rise time, have a non-shortened rise time that is longer than the shortened rise time. Kojima fails to disclose or suggest above-mentioned distinguishing features (1)-(3) as recited in independent claim 1.

Rather Kojima teaches that a scan electrode 17Y receives a sustain pulse having a shortened rise time  $t_0$  (see rise time  $t_0$  of pulse 31 of Figs. 6 and 7) and teaches that a sustain electrode 17X receives a sustain pulse having a non-shortened rise time ( $t_{1a}$ ,  $t_{1b}$  and  $t_{1c}$ ), which is a rise time longer than rise time  $t_0$  (see pulses 32a, 32b and 32c of Fig 6).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Kojima teaches that only scan electrode 17Y

receives a shortened sustain pulse 31 having a rise time  $t_0$  (i.e., the sustain electrode 17X receives pulses having a rise time that is longer than  $t_0$ ), but fails to disclose or suggest that a rise time of a sustain pulse applied to the scan electrode is shortened at a frequency of once every three times a sustain pulse is applied thereto, and a rise time of a sustain pulse applied to the sustain electrode is shortened at a frequency of once every three times a sustain pulse is applied thereto, as required by claim 1.

In addition, for the same reasons, Kojima also fails to disclose or suggest that the sustain pulses, applied to both the scan and sustain electrodes between the sustain pulses having the shortened rise times that are applied to both the scan and sustain electrodes, have a non-shortened rise time that is longer than the shortened rise time, as recited by claim 1. Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claim 4 that depends therefrom are not anticipated by Kojima.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Kojima or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kojima to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claim 4 that depends therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

New independent claim 3 is directed to a method and recites features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1 (e.g., sustain pulses having a shortened rise time are applied to both the scan and sustain electrodes in a specific manner). Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 3 is allowable over Kojima.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kunihiro MIMA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2008.05.30 16:12:30 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap  
Registration No. 60,554  
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
May 30, 2008